Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 21

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina

Part XV -B

February 19, 2007

> February 13, 2007
>
> Dear Mr Ali Sina
>
> When I say that many modern-day Muslims are not following Islam, I say so because Islam's message is extremely tolerant. I'll give you two examples. At the time of the prophet, Allah's mercy be on him, there were some hypocrites who would come to his gatherings and would teasingly say 'ra'ina' by twisting their tongue so that instead of its customary meanings (i.e. may I beg your pardon) it should mean "O our shepherd". The Qur'an asked the believers to abandon that word altogether and use another, synonymous word 'unzurna' in case they want to ask the prophet to repeat what he was saying. (2:104) Had the message of Islam been violent, the Qur'an should have asked such people to be taken to task immediately.

Dear scholar friends Mr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer.

This time I delayed my response because you had complained that I respond too quick and this does does not allow the readers to absorb what you said properly. I am sure this time they have absorbed everything you said fully since your response has been published nearly a week ago here..

I must admit that you have a very unorthodox way of defining tolerance. Muhammad could not tolerate anyone criticizing him and ordered the execution of those who, many years earlier, had ridiculed him. He even had zero tolerance for those who wanted to believe in their own faiths and did not want to submit to his unsubstantiated claims. I am at lost trying to understand your definition of tolerance. This story you are telling us is not the sign of Muhammad's tolerance but an indication of his paranoia and intolerance. Muhammad was a narcissist and as such he was insecure of himself and suspicious of everyone. So he prohibited people saying an Arabic word because he suspected, they were saying something different to mock him, and you think just because he did not "took to task immediately" i.e. did not order their execution, he was a tolerant man? Is this your standard for tolerance? No wonder you call yourself tolerant and moderate when you repeatedly have stated that anyone who does not believe in Islam or anyone who leaves it does not deserver to live in

this world and must be put to death. The irony is that Muslims are the most intolerant people on the face of the planet and despite that they are absolutely sure to be very tolerant.

My erudite friends, allow me to explain the concept of tolerance as I, and the rest of non-Muslim portion of humanity understand it. Tolerance means you are fair, objective, and permissive toward those whose opinions and religion differ from yours. It means that you treat others with the same respect and consideration that you would like to be treated yourself. How can you be tolerant when you say those who reject Islam do not deserve to live in this world anymore? How would you like to be put to death because of your faith? What would you say to a person who believes you don't deserve living in this world because your religion is different from his? Would you call such a person tolerant? If not, then you are not tolerant and neither was your prophet.

> Likewise, there were others who used to make fun of Islam in their gatherings during the time of the prophet. The Qur'an asked the believers to leave their company when people were ridiculing their religion and to rejoin them when they engaged in some other discussion. (6:68-69; 5:57-58) Again, going by the impression you are creating about Islam, such people should have been asked by the Qur'an to be killed or at least inflicted with exemplary punishment.

The Sura 6 is a Meccan Sura. When Muhammad said these things, he was weak and when one is weak one can't be intolerant. You can be intolerant only when you are strong. When Muhammad went to Medina and became strong he became very intolerant. Sura Maida is Medinan and there is nothing tolerant in the verses 5.57-58 you quoted. Here Muhammad is saying "take not for friends and protectors those who take your religion for a mockery or sport,- whether among those who received the Scripture before you, or among those who reject Faith". How do you interpret this as a tolerant verse? If you find someone urging others NOT to take Muslims as friends and allies because they ridicule trinity, would you say that this person is a tolerant person?

Muhammad was not tolerant. He remembered those who ridiculed him and years later, when he came back to Mecca he sought them and took his revenge despite having promised that if the Meccans surrender with no fight he would spare their lives.

The Qur'an should be read in its context. The so-called tolerant verses of the Qur'an are all Meccan verses while the Medinan verses are violent and intolerant. The following are examples of the kind of verses that Muhammad wrote in Mecca .

1. Be patient with what they say, and part from them courteously. (Q.73:10)
2. To you be your religion, and to me my religion. (Q. 109:6)
3. Therefore be patient with what they say, and celebrate (constantly) the praises of your Lord. (Q.20:103)
4. Speak good to men. (Q.2:83)

5. We well know what the infidels say: but you are not to compel them. (Q.50:45)
6. Hold to forgiveness; command what is right; But turn away from the ignorant. (Q.7:119)
7. Pardon thou, with a gracious pardoning. (Q.15:85)
8. Tell those who believe, to forgive those who do not look forward to the Days of Allâh. (Q.45:14)
9. Those who follow the Jewish (scriptures), and the Christians - any who believe in Allâh and the Last Day, and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve. (Q.2:62)
10. And do not dispute with the followers of the Book except by what is best. (Q.29:46)

Now let us compare them to those written later in Medina when Muhammad became powerful.

1. Oh you who believe! Murder those of the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you. (Q.9:123)
2. I will instill terror into the hearts of the unbelievers: smite above their necks and smite all their finger-tips off. (Q.8:12)
3. Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him. (Q.3:85)
4. Slay the idolaters wherever you find them. (Q.9:5)
5. Kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from wherever they drove you out. (Q.2:191)
6. Fight them on until there is no more dissention and religion becomes that of Allâh. (Q.9:193)
7. Fight them, and Allâh will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame. (Q.9:14)
8. Make no excuses: you have rejected Faith after you had accepted it. If We pardon some of you, We will punish others amongst you, for that they are in sin. (Q.9:66)
9. You who believe! Verily, the Mushrikûn (unbelievers) are Najasun (impure). So let them not come near Al-Masjid-al-Harâm (the grand mosque at Mecca) after this year. (Q.9:28)
10. Fight those who do not believe in Allâh and the last day... and fight People of the Book, who do not accept the religion of truth (Islam) until they pay tribute by hand, being inferior. (Q.9:29)

There is a big difference between the Meccan and the Medinan verses. We see that Muhammad is transformed from a preacher to a despot and when he had the power, he did not have to play the “nice guy” and started showing his real face unmasked. And it was ugly. Very ugly.

As for the battles with non-believers and the later possibility of killings of some people, I have mentioned it several times that such events happened either when battles were forced upon Muslims or when at the culmination of the prophetic mission God inflicted his punishment on the intransigent disbelievers as had always been His way in the case of all earlier messengers like Noah, God's mercy be on him.

As for your first alibi, at no time the non-Muslims had imposed any war or Muslims. All the wars and hostilities were initiated by Muhammad and his followers just as the Muslims today are the initiators of virtually all hostilities with others.

As for your second alibi, the fables of the Bible are just that – fables. You yourself do not believe in the Bible and at anytime it contradicts your faith you disregard that book, except when you want to justify the evil deeds of your prophet. Furthermore the so-called punishments of God are acts of nature. The biblical prophets had nothing to do with hurricanes, floods, earthquake, etc. Whether these phenomena are ordered by God intentionally to kill people indiscriminately or not is another story. I already talked about that in my previous responses. Obviously you did not read what I wrote. Let us assume these natural calamities are sent to men deliberately by a malicious and vengeful god. Okay, we have no control over what this god does. All we can do is get away from the danger and abort his malicious attacks on us. Thanks to the science it is now easier to predict when these calamities are going to hit and seek safety. So as you see, we humans are gradually making this old guy helpless and toothless. However, my problem is when a human assumes the role of God and starts massacring innocent people. This is something we must not tolerate. What right did Muhammad have to do that? Your justification of Muhammad's killings is no different from that of Hitler who
wrote:

Hence today I believe that I am acting in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator: by defending myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord.

Anyone can claim to be sent by God doing the Lord's work to justify his crimes with divine authority. Playing God is the wet dream of the narcissist. In Uganda , a mad man, Joseph Kony calls himself messenger of God. He is the founder of Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). He kidnaps children and transforms them into killing machines, much like what Muhammad did. He takes them back to their villages and orders them to kill their parents with machete, to prove their faith. If they refuse he massacres the entire family. Just like your psychopath prophet this mad man also has divine justification for his crimes. Muhammad, like Knoi and Hitler was sick in the head.

What about you Dr. Zaheer and Mr. Ghamidi? How can you, who are sane and intelligent people believe in a monster like Muhammad and justify his crimes? If you believe in God aren't you afraid to stand if front of him one day and respond for your belief in an evil man like Muhammad? How can you cover your shame when he asks you, did you think I am so

stupid to send a criminal as a prophet? Didn't you think that by taking a pervert sadist like Muhammad as my messenger you were committing blasphemy? The followers of Kony are children. They are brought up by this monster and murder is the only life they know. What are your excuses? Even though you, like all other Muslims, have been brainwashed since childhood, you are now adults and quite intelligent. You have no excuses for following a psychopath mass murderer.

> As to the question why you can't see the clear communication that took place during the time when the punishments were inflicted, the answer is that you are not living in the times of a messenger. Had you been there at the time of any of the messengers, you would have received the message quite as clearly and would have either believed or perished (or lived a life of subjugation). For all the other times, it's a matter for the people to decide on the basis of their own understanding and the decision about them would be taken on the Day of judgment by the All-Knowing God whether the message was convincingly communicated to them or not, and if it was, whether their response was acceptable or not.

I already answered this. You don't seem to read what I write or pay much attention and yet you accuse me of not pondering upon what you say and respond quickly, despite the fact that I respond to every paragraph you write. What you say is not news to me. These were the same fallacies I used to believe for years. I thought a lot about them 13 years ago and now I have the answer. I do not have to solve a problem that is already solved. However, you have no clue about my side of the story and why I say Muhammad was an imposter and instead of reading my arguments and try to refute them, you simply avoid reading them. As the result you keep repeating the same things in each message.

Even if the prophethood of Muhammad was obvious to those around him, as you say, it is not obvious to us. The truth of his claim is not clear to me and despite asking you several times to give us one evidence that he was a prophet of God, you have not done it yet. You have not done it because you can't and all you can say is that those who saw him were convinced. How do you know that? Maybe many of them were not convinced but afraid to speak out or leave him. This kind of response does not satisfy me. I dismiss it as fallacy. This fallacy that is so close to Muslims' hearts and they use it often is called *argumentum ad veracundiam*. Those who followed Jim Jones also saw the evidence that he was a great Messiah. They were so convinced that when Jones told them drink poison and die, they did it happily. Also those who believed in David Koresh, Charles Manson or Shoko Asahara were convinced. Like Muslims they went around killing innocent people. Is their faith enough proof for you and I? Each person has to see the proof for himself. You claimed that you have such proof and that your reversion to Islam was logical and not emotional. So where is that proof? Now that I am asking you to show that proof, you renege and talk about everything else but the proofs. You trust the intelligence of some Arabs who lived 1400 years ago and think if Islam was good for them, it is good for you too. What about others who did not see such evidence in Muhammad and did not believe in him despite the fact that they knew him since childhood? Why should I believe that Abul Hakam, Abu Lahab, Abu Sufyan and Nadr

ibn Harith were less intelligent than the slaves Aba Dar, Bilal, the violent and bigot Omar and the butcher Ali?

You are engaging in fallacy after fallacy. It is not logical to put your faith on the understanding of a bunch of Arabs of the 7th century who engaged in highway robbery and rape. You must see the proof for yourself. You claimed to have seen it but now you are saying something else and are shying away from giving that proof. If you saw the proof show it to us.

When Galileo claimed that the Earth is rotating around the Sun, when Darwin presented his theory of evolution, or when Einstein stipulated that 90% of the mass of the universe is made of dark matter, these were theories. But because they were true, the passage of time revealed their truth. This is the characteristic of truth. Truth has a tendency to self-manifest. And you are telling us that the truth of Islam has faded in time? If Islam is true how can such thing happen? This is not logical. If the perceived evidence of the truth of Islam has disappeared, it is because it was never truth. If we adhere to the law of logics, we should only conclude that because truth is emerging falsehood is vanishing. That is why what the ignorant people of the 7th century Arabia thought to be true, does not appear to us as truth anymore. We are more intelligent than those barbarians. Those ignorant people had no problem accepting a God that orders robbery, assassination and rape. Now we know no real God would send a fiend like Muhammad to guide mankind. That is against intelligence and commonsense. The messenger of God must be flawless. Muhammad was evil in the true sense of the word. I do not believe in Jesus but I can't denounce him as evil because he was not. That is why Islam seems false to us and it didn't to those savages. They were barbarians and ignorant and we are intelligent and civilized. Anyway, if the evidence of the truth of Islam has evaporated, as you claim we can't be held responsible for rejecting it. God gave us intelligence to use it. Once we use our intelligence we see that Islam is nothing but a satanic cult. A just God would not punish us for rejecting something that is illogical and seems to be evil.

Now, let us be honest Dr. Zaheer and Mr. Ghamidi. Do you have any proof that Muhammad was a prophet of God or the proof is lost? It's either one or the other. You made both these contradictory claims, as if you want to have have your cake and eat it too. If you have the proof, show it to us without further ado and if the proof is lost then admit that there is no proof and do not make such claims and admit that your faith is subjective.

Had the divine law of worldly punishment for the disbelievers of the messengers not been implemented at the time of the prophet, it would have meant that He was inconsistent in dealing with the nations who receive the message from His messengers directly. God has always been consistent in treating the enemies of His messengers. It is only He who can decide to take life. He sometimes does it through natural calamities and on other occasions through humans

Which God are you talking about? That is not the God that Jesus or Zoroaster talked about. In fact Allah is completely inconsistent with the God of Christianity. Jesus said turn the other cheek and Allah says “retaliation is prescribed for you in the matter of the slain, the free for the free, and the slave for the slave, and the female for the female.” (Q.2:178) In other words, if someone kills your slave, you are allowed to kill his slave and if someone kills your son or daughter, you can kill his son or daughter. What can be more stupid than this? Even Muslims who blindly follow everything Muhammad said do not practice this insane injunction. When a prostitute was brought to Jesus, he said let the one who has not committed sin throw the first stone while in a similar incident Muhammad urged the Jews who had abandoned the barbaric practice of stoning to stone a woman accused of adultery. Jesus sat with sinners, ate with them and befriended with them and Muhammad said the unbelievers are filthy (najes) do not associate with them. Jesus said forgive the sins of others so yours can be forgiven in heaven and Muhammad was utterly incapable of forgiving people who had done nothing but mock him. Because Allah is incompatible with the God of Jesus we must not accept him.

So either Muhammad was lying or Jesus was a liar. Their messages are incompatible and their gods are different. You don’t have to be a rocket scientist to know which one of the two was lying. Muhammad said that Jesus was a messenger of God. If he was not, then Muhammad has said a lie and therefore he can’t be a messenger of God. If Jesus was a messenger of God, Muhammad can't be because these two men stand in opposite poles. One is the personification of everything that is divine and the other is the representation of everything that is demonic and evil. Furthermore Jesus warned people of false prophets and he even gave a clue to detect them. He said you would recognize them by their fruits. Look at the fruits of Islam. I think it is enough evidence to conclude that Muhammad was a false prophet. The fruits of Islam are ignorance, bigotry, fanaticism, intolerance, violence, misogyny, discrimination, terrorism, dictatorship, wars, poverty and misery.

> However, unless we have a direct sanction from God, we humans can’t do it on our own. Since the termination of the process of revelation, nobody has a sanction to kill anyone anymore except if the state awards capital punishment for killing or causing mischief on the land.

The terrorists think they have direct sanction to do what they do and they are right. In no place in the Qur'an it says Jihad must stop after the death of Muhammad or at any other time. Jihad must continue until the entire world becomes Dar al Salam. However, since Muslims are divided and each group denounces others and calls them heretics, if they conquer the world they will start killing one another on a massive scale. Islam is a cult of terror and murder. Dr. Ghamidi himself has been the target of Islamic assassination and at the same time he prescribes death for unbelievers and apostates. As long as you are Muslims, and follow a terrorist mad man you do what he did and you can’t be called tolerant. It makes no difference which school of thought or sect one belongs to or how one interprets the Qur'an. All the Muslims believe in the same book of terror and follow the examples set by

the same chief terrorist. The difference between the Muslims is in their flavor. In essence they are all made of the same substance and have the same characteristics. You have been honest enough to show us what a moderate Muslim means. If you are the example of a moderate Muslim Islam is dangerous and it must be eradicated.

Killing people for what they believe or don't believe is not something the civilized world can tolerate. You think your understanding of the truth is perfect and so dose everyone else. If we each start killing each other because our truths are different what will become of this world? How can a real God say such a stupid thing? Humans are fallible. People genuinely and with all good intentions make mistake and interpret things, including books claimed to be words of God, in different ways. If each one of us thinks that he has divine sanction to kill those who disagree with what we think is truth then everyone should start killing everyone else.

Assuming Satan wanted to destroy mankind. What better way could he devise than sending someone as the messenger of God who would tell people to kill those who do not believe?

> That brings me to the question of the rewards and punishments immediately after death. You have advertised quite strongly in your website that I am shying away from answering it. I apologize for missing it out completely. The mention of people getting fed after death is of course not in the material sense. The word 'rizq' in Arabic is used, as indeed it has been done in the Qur'an, to mean the source that enables you to sustain and grow whether materially, intellectually, or spiritually. Those who are living at the time of messengers have the message communicated to them most clearly and therefore their accountability is already completed in this world. They thus get rewards and punishments for their performance immediately after death. However, such rewards and punishments are given in a non-material form after death and they will take a physical form after the Day of Judgment. For instance, the Qur'an mentions about a believer at the time of Moses, who was threatened by Pharaoh of dire consequences thus: "So God rescued him from their evil designs and Pharaoh and his companions were engulfed by a severe punishment: (It is) the fire they are brought before every morning and evening; and on the day when judgment would take place (it would be said): Enter (O Pharaoh and) his companions an even more severe punishment." (40:45-46)

After realizing that I am not going to give up, you finally came up with this answer. Is this response supported by any other verse in the Qur'an or any hadith? This is not a minor statement but a major difference between those who lived at the time of Muhammad and the rest of mankind. It basically shows that God has a two tier system, of which we were not aware yet. If this answer is true and as you say, the companions of Muhammad, who had received his direct message, had the added advantage of surviving in the form of spirit while the rest of mankind would disappear to only rise at the Last Day, this would have been trumpeted in various verses and huge discussions would have been dedicated to it. Nothing of that exists in the entire Islamic literature and the Ulama who have even discussed in detail with which foot one has to enter the toilet, on which side of the body one has to place most of his weight during defecation and how many rocks one has to use for cleaning purposes

after responding to the call of the nature, have been uncharacteristically silent on this very important subject. Can you tell us why? I will tell you why. It's because such a thing does not exist in Islam. You just made it up. What else could you say in the face of this obvious discrepancy within the Qur'an?

According to Islam the archangel Israfil will sound a horn sending out a "blast of truth". Muslim apologist, John Esposito, in The Oxford Dictionary of Islam (Oxford University Press. ISBN 0-19-512558-4, p.264 2003) says that according to traditions, Muhammad will be the first to be brought back to life.

Will you please explain how can the companions of Muhammad enter in a spiritual state of existence until the Last Day when he himself doesn't? And if Esposito is wrong, can you show us a few hadith or Quranic verses to corroborate your claim?

What about the punishment of the grave? How do you explain this?

Ibn Abbas narrated: The Prophet once passed by two graves and said, "These two persons are being tortured not for a major sin (to avoid). One of them never saved himself from being soiled with his urine, while the other used to go about with calumnies(to make enmity between friends)." The Prophet then took a green leaf of a date-palm tree, split it into (pieces) and fixed one on each grave. They said, "O Allah's Apostle! Why have you done so?" He replied, "I hope that their punishment might be lessened till these (the pieces of the leaf) become dry." (See the foot-note of Hadith 215) *Bukhari Volume 1, Book 4, Number 217*

If there is no consciousness after death until the Last Day, how can corpses in the grave be punished? This hadith is reported in several places. Another version of it says that Muhammad actually heard the voices of two humans who were being tortured in their graves. [*Bukhari Volume 8, Book 73, Number 81*]. Shall we believe in the hallucinations of this mad man?

> You have mentioned that I am no different from Osama bin Laden. The difference between me and Osama is that while I believe that the message of Islam is extremely tolerant, as demonstrated by the verses referred to above and many more, he has mistaken the passages that were meant for the times of the messengers alone to be applicable to all non-Muslims of the world.

The only difference is the way you interpret the Qur'an. Can you convince bin Laden or any Muslim that your interpretation is the right one and theirs is not? I think bin Laden's interpretation is the correct one. Furthermore, both of you believe that unbelievers do not deserve to live in this world and that along with the apostates. they should be killed. I honestly do not see much difference between your position and his. All Muslims, irrespective of how they interpret the Qur'an, are victims of a lie. The Qur'an is a very confused book, but not when it comes to killing. The message of hate and violence in the Qur'an is loud and clear.

I believe Osama belongs to the category of people who when they make up their mind about something they are not prepared to change it.

What about you? Are you capable of changing your mind? I believe you are. But you are not showing it in public. Of course you can't do that and I am not going to press you to do it. I leave that to you and your conscience. At the end you must answer to your creator. Faith blinds, I hope this is not true in your case.

One friend wrote and said he had communicated with you and you were confident that that you are winning this debate. In that case my I ask to please publish it in your site so everyone in Pakistan can see how you came out victorious? If you don't I am afraid that this friend will start thinking that you were bluffing and that you have serious doubts about your self declared victory.

When they engage in a dialogue with others, they are not even listening; instead, they are preparing their rebuttals against it. All such people, whether Muslims or non-Muslims, are condemned by the Qur'an: "You think they are listening to you even though they are not… it is equal whether you invite them or not…." It is this attitude which to me is the most dangerous: Those who pose as if they are engaging in an open dialogue even though they have made a firm commitment that they are not going to accept anything against what they have already decided. I find this attitude more disgusting than anything else. It is this sick mind that is the cause of most woes of our world.

Haven't you made your mind already? Isn't this what all believers do? I have made my mind because I have not seen the evidence of the truth of Islam. On the contrary, I have plenty of evidence against it. However, should you give one evidence in support of Islam, I will acknowledge it and agree with you. Will you please give us one proof to back your claim that Islam is true? As long as you have not given a single proof you can't pass judgments saying I am not listening or it makes no difference whether you give the proof or not. First you have to present your proof and if I can't refute it and still deny it, then you can pass those judgments.

You have accused that the Qur'an has plagiarized the Bible. I am sure you haven't read the two books carefully or you wouldn't have made that statement. The Qur'an states some of the things mentioned in the Bible more clearly and more convincingly. It points out the mistakes in the Bible; and it also confirms certain aspects of the Bible as correct and authentic. Moreover, it makes an emphatic claim that the arrival of prophet Muhammad was clearly prophesied in the earlier books.

No, Dear Dr. Zaheer. The Qur'an does not mention anything that is in the Bible more clearly. It simply alludes to those stories summarily as if realizing that its audience is already familiar

with them and therefore there is no need to explain them in detail. If one has not studied the Bible and has never heard of Job, Noah, Abraham or Moses, one cannot understand the Quran. However, sometimes there are discrepancies between the stories of the Bible and the allusions made to them in the Qur'an. This is due to the fact that Muhammad was an illiterate man with little knowledge. He relied on his memory and hearsay to rehash those stories. For example, he thought that Marry the mother of Christ, is part of trinity. At no time this has been the case. However, seeing the reverence that the Christians had for Marry made him come to this erroneous conclusion. In another place he confuses Marry the Mother of Jesus (Maryam in Arabic) with Miriam the sister of Moses and Aaron (also Maryam in Arabic). When those who knew the Bible caught his errors he lost his temper and became angry, lashing out at them he said the Bible is mistaken. This is consistent with his narcissistic personality disorder and megalomania. His gigantic ego would not allow him to admit that he had been wrong and instead of apologizing he pulled out his sock puppet Allah out of his sleeve to support him.

Tabari tells us that a group of Jews went to Muhammad and asked him about the creation. He told them

"God created the Earth on Sunday and Monday. Then he created the mountains on Tuesday. On Wednesday he created the cities, the vegetation, the rivers, and every development and ruin. [This is word-by-word translation. God created the cities and even the ruins before he created Adam] On Thursday he created the skies and the angels, which lasted to three hours before the end of Friday. Then during the first hour of the remainder of Friday he created ajals, the times of the deaths [I assume it means he established the time of the death of humans]. In the next hour he created the diseases [Yep that is exactly what it says. He created the diseases even before he created Adam] and in the third hour he created Adam. The Jews said; if you had said that God rested on Saturday we knew you were telling the truth. The Messenger of Allah became angry and Allah revealed the verse (*46.33)*: “Have they not considered that Allah, Who created the heavens and the earth and was not tired by their creation?” [Tabari Vol I Page 30 Persian translation]

The fact that both the Bible and the Qur'an are books of absurdity and any sane person reading these fables of creation can see they are unscientific, is another subject. The point that I want to make is that Muhammad often made errors when plagiarizing from the Bible. He was not a scholar but a very ignorant man, and he got angry if someone pointed his mistakes out.

I have a theory to explain why people get angry when they are engaged in a debate. When you have a response to what the other person is saying or you are prepared to admit that you could be wrong, you wouldn't ever get angry. However, if you don't have a genuine response to the other person's points and you don't even want to admit that you are wrong, you lose your temper. A normal, decent person is always polite.

Khalid Zaheer

(Words: 1138)

Thank you for your explanation. I could not agree more. That is exactly what I thought when I read the above story of Muhammad reported by Tabari. Do you still want to follow an indecent and impolite man?